Why did Paul Hoch who, as a physicist should have known better, attempt to duplicate the JFK head-shot with wrongly-attached melons?Why did Bob Smith, of CTIA, also a scientist, go off on a kick about explosive bullets without satisfying himself that the incontrovertible evidence permitted consideration of their use in the JFK assassination? I have often wondered about this atypical behavior by both. If Smith went off on his kick because Garrison had talked of explosive bullets, it was a long-delayed reaction. In The Day of the Jackal, Viking 8/71;Bantam 9/72, the assassin uses explosive bullets and for sighting his piece in, a melon. The Day of the Jackal is said to be based on fact. I don't know if it is and I see nothing wrong with serious consideration of a novelist's ideas, if they can be given serious consideration without known factors ruling them out. In both of these case, there is no doubt that what is not reasonably questioned rules out the use of melons with respect to the JFK head wound(s) and explosive bullets as causative. HW 2/11/73